

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 09 2006

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT: Keith Myers

DOCKET NO.: 0555.001

SERIAL NO.: 10/780,145

FILED: 02/17/2004

EXAMINER: Richard V. Muralidhar

ART UNIT: 2838

TITLE: Series Resonant Capacitive Discharge Motor

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450Les A. Boegemann  
A BOEGEMANN LAW FIRM, PLC  
688 W. 4<sup>th</sup> St., Suite D  
Benson, AZ 85602

## CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that on the 9th day of December, 2006, this correspondence is faxed to the USPTO fax number: 1-571-273-8300.

By   
Les A. BoegemannTO THE COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
RESPONSE FOR SUBMISSION WITH RCE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.114

Dear Sir:

This is an Interview Summary containing the substance of an interview conducted November 6, 2006, a statement of which was sent by the USPTO to my attention on November 13, 2006.

On November 6, 2006, the inventor, Keith Myers, myself, Attorney Les A. Boegemann, and the Examiner, Richard V. Muralidhar discussed the differences between the instant patent application and the prior art, specifically Pollus (US 6384564). While

several distinctions exist between the two, we solicited assistance from the Examiner in drafting proper claims.

One obvious and glaring difference between the two invention is that the device described by Pollock uses a steady state power supply to place a DC voltage on the circuit while the instant invention utilizes a controlled voltage source to intermittently place voltage on different nodes during different times in the device's operation. Additionally, the instant invention includes a control circuit and sensor which monitors the status of a rotor and sends this as input to the voltage source controller. Control signals are then sent from the voltage source controller to the controlled voltage source, directing it to, at various times in the circuits operation, to place a charge on certain terminals.

Additionally, the instant invention includes a drain circuit to remove residual charge from the same nodes, when said nodes are not currently being charged by the controlled voltage source. For all these reasons, and more, it was decided by all persons which were party to the conversation that the instant invention was, indeed, novel.

A commitment was made by the inventor's attorney to draft claims that more fully illustrated these novel features and the Examiner agreed to review same without undue reservation.

The applicant and his attorney thank the Examiner for his thorough review of the application and his time spent discussing the invention.

Respectfully submitted,



Les A. Boegemann

Reg. No. 50,121

(520) 586-0178 phone  
(520) 586-0179 fax